MASS. HS1.2:M38/4

UMASS/AMHERST
312066 0374 6997 0

MASSACHUSETTS DAY REPORTING CENTERS

GOVERNMENT DOCUMENTS COLLECTION
DEC 3 1991
University of Massachusetts
Depository Copy

PREPARED FOR:
The Executive Office of Human Services
BY:
Elizabeth L. Curtin, Crime and Justice Foundation
Jack McDevitt, Center for Applied Social Research, Northeastern University

NIC Grant # 89JO/GHEO

912 R33

This document was prepared under grant number 89JO/GHEO from the National Institute of Corrections, U.S. Department of Justice. The National Institute of Corrections reserves the right to reproduce, publish, translate, or otherwise use, and to authorize others to publish and use, all or any part of the copyrighted material contained in this publication.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Executive Summary	i
Background	1
Project Process	1
Development of Standards	3
Management Information System	4
Pre-Trial Detainees	7
Recommendations	8
Appendix	9

FINAL REPORT TO NIC
DEVELOPMENT OF STANDARDS AND MIS SYSTEM FOR DAY REPORTING CENTERS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Early in 1989, the Executive Office of Human Services (EOHS) organized a task force to develop standards and a management information system for Massachusetts Day Reporting Centers. With a technical assistance grant from the National Institute of Corrections, EOHS contracted with the Crime and Justice Foundation and the Center for Applied Social Research of Northeastern University to act as consultants for the task force.

Members of the task force included representatives of the 5 day reporting centers, Sheriff's departments, Department of Correction, Parole Board and the Comprehensive Offender Employment Resource System. The task force held five meetings during the past year.

The first step of the task force was to survey the existing programs to establish a base of information from which to work. The initial survey found common policies and procedures around offense, termination, drug testing and community notification. Areas with the most differences were frequency of reporting, frequency of drug testing, sentenced versus pre-trial admissions, and participation of female offenders.

The survey also revealed varied eligibility criteria among the programs. The task force worked to establish standardized eligibility criteria to be applied statewide, but which also allowed for individual program uniqueness. The criteria address: time to release, offense exclusion, period of confinement, warrants, restraining orders, disciplinary reports, community notification, classification, residence, means of support and telephone access.

A set of minimum standards were developed which cover legal authorization, screening/assessment, program, and administration. The standards will be applied statewide, but should be seen as a dynamic set of minimum criteria - to be used as part of an on-going process of development to be modified as law, experience and climate dictate.

The task force developed and has implemented a standardized MIS type reporting system. After analyzing current practices, it was decided to collect individual level data from each program by means of an individual case sheet. A standardized format for quarterly reporting was also developed.

An initial run of the data reported during the period of October through December 1989 revealed a successful completion rate of 78%. This preliminary data indicates that 93% of the participants were male, 70% single, 50% Caucasian, 50% non-Caucasian (primarily Black and Hispanic), 54% without a high school diploma, and 80% with substance abuse problems.

Common offenses for which participants were sentenced included operating under the influence, narcotics offenses, burglary, larceny, receiving stolen goods, and probation violations. An additional 10% were incarcerated for assaultive offenses.

One-half of the participants were released with some form of electronic monitoring. Both passive and active systems were in use.

Most of the participants worked or were enrolled in school. 15% performed some form of community service work. 13% were involved in restitution with the victim of their crime.

The task force discussed the needs of special populations such as pre-trial detainees, substance abusers and female offenders.

- For pre-trial detainees, a separate set of standards were developed to apply to their different legal status.

- Regarding substance abusers, the standards advise the inclusion of a strong treatment component in each program design which is linked to community-based treatment resources.

- Regarding the needs of female offenders housed at MCI Framingham, the standards advise that programs give particular attention to interfacing with the institution, to screening and assessment practices and to staff sensitivity to the unique needs of female offenders.

Recommendations of the consultants include:

- An increase in resources in order to expand the use of day reporting centers to more clients and to more jurisdictions;

- The expansion of the defined target population to include a wider variety of offenders, based more on client profile than on current offense;

- The expansion of the use of day reporting centers for female offenders and continued efforts to streamline their admission process;

- The continued use of day reporting centers for pre-trial detainees and continued tracking of their unique situation; and

- A post program recidivism study to be conducted by outside evaluators comparing day reporting clients with similar inmates.

Finally, members of the task force felt strongly that the group should continue to meet periodically to discuss issues regarding the programs and to provide support to the existing programs as well as to new day reporting centers as they are developed.

I. Background

In 1985, a Special Commission on Correctional Alternatives was convened by Governor Michael Dukakis to study alternatives to incarceration and to recommend specific programs which could be implemented within Massachusetts. The Commission's final report, submitted to the Governor in July 1986, recommended among other alternatives the establishment of day supervision centers, patterned after day centres operating in Great Britain.

With private foundation support from the Florence V. Burden Foundation and the German Marshall Fund of the United States, and technical assistance from the Crime and Justice Foundation, the first day reporting center in the country opened in the Fall of 1986 in Hampden County (Springfield) Massachusetts. The center proved to be a viable alternative, capable of supervising offenders in the community without endangering public safety and also capable of reducing the level of overcrowding plaguing this and other county correctional facilities.

Based on the results of the Special Commission report and the early success of the Hampden County program, the Massachusetts legislature appropriated funding in Fiscal Year 1988 for an alternative grant program to be administered by the Executive Office of Human Services (EOHS). With day centers targeted as a priority, the grant program provided operations funding for four new day reporting centers and expansion funding for the Hampden county program.

As of the end of 1988, all of the programs were functioning successfully, although with varying operational philosophies. Some of the programs have a treatment oriented philosophy, others are more security oriented. Some follow strict eligibility criteria, others have a loosely defined admission policy. With calls for the establishment of day centers in every county, it became obvious to EOHS that certain guidelines and data collection practices were necessary in order to ensure consistency and adherence to minimum standards of operation statewide.

The Executive Office of Human Services sought assistance from the Crime and Justice Foundation and Northeastern University's Center for Applied Social Research in convening a task force to develop standards and a management information system for the Massachusetts day reporting centers. An initial meeting of the Massachusetts programs was held in October 1988, and resulted in the development of the task force whose activities are described in this final report.

II. Project Process

As mentioned above, the Executive Office of Human Services (EOHS) established a

task force early in 1989 to develop standards and a Management Information System for the state's day reporting centers. The task force was organized to include not only all of the operating day reporting centers, but also representatives of state and county agencies with jurisdiction over day center clients. The task force was made up of: Amy Singer, Laurie Hull, David Shea and Michael Richards from EOHS; John Larivee and Elizabeth Curtin from the Crime and Justice Foundation; Jack McDevitt from Northeastern University; Diane Cherven and Ernest Dulin from the Metropolitan Day Reporting Center; Kevin Warwick and Ralph Schenarts from the Hampden County Day Reporting Center; Jay Ashe and Kate DeCou from the Hampden County Sheriff's Department; Richard LaBonte from Worcester's Correctional Opportunities Advancement Program (Project COAP); Michael Regan from Norfolk County's Electronic Incarceration Program; Peter Peroncello from the Norfolk County Sheriff's Department; Ed Dolan from the Massachusetts Parole Board; Paul DiPaulo and Tom Connolly from the Massachusetts Department of Correction; Kathleen Donovan from the Middlesex County Sheriff's Department; David Intraversato from the Plymouth County Correctional Alternative Program; James O'Brien from the Suffolk County Jail; Steve O'Brien from MCI Framingham; and Terri Theaux from the Comprehensive Offender Employment Resource System.

It was decided that the task force should meet on a rotating basis at each day center site in order to increase the overall familiarity across programs. The first meeting of the Day Reporting Center Task Force (DRCTF) took place on June 12, 1989 at the Metropolitan Day Reporting Center. During that meeting, Liz Curtin and Jack McDevitt presented the results of a survey of policies and record keeping practices at each of the five DRC's. The survey indicated broad variation across the five programs in both policies and record keeping practices. It was decided to set up a series of meetings to develop consistent standards and practices across all Massachusetts DRC programs.

The second DRCTF meeting was held in Springfield at the Hampden County Day Reporting Center on July 20, 1989. At this meeting, task force members discussed the legal authorization for day reporting centers based on Massachusetts statutes, and reviewed the draft of a community release agreement. In addition, an initial draft of the information system forms (monthly and quarterly) was circulated. A discussion ensued regarding procedures for data collection and the information to be collected.

The third meeting of the DRCTF took place on September 20, 1989 at Project COAP in Worcester. The discussion at this meeting included a comparison of the practices of each program. In particular, the discussion concentrated on variations in program eligibility criteria. Also at that meeting, a first draft of the legal authority standards and a revised draft of monthly and quarterly reporting forms were distributed for comment.

On November 2, 1989 the fourth meeting of the DRCTF occurred at the Electronic Incarceration Program in Dedham. At this meeting, the task force agreed on a set of

reporting forms and a procedure for reporting the information to EOHS. The task force also agreed on eligibility standards for DRC programs.

A subcommittee of the task force was formed to deal with the specific issues posed by the increasing use of DRC's for pre-trial detainees. The subcommittee was composed of: David Shea of EOHS, Liz Curtin of the Crime and Justice Foundation, Jack McDevitt of Northeastern University, Kevin Warwick of the Hampden County DRC, David Intraversato of the Plymouth DRC, and James O'Brien of the Suffolk County Jail. At a subcommittee meeting on November 16, 1989, discussion of the variation in standards necessary for pre-trial clients led to revision of the standards for the pre-trial population.

On February 14, 1990, the fifth and final meeting of the DRCTF took place at the Suffolk County Jail. At this meeting a final version of the individual case sheets and the quarterly progress reports was agreed upon. In addition, issues regarding the identification and support of women clients were discussed, with a number of programs expressing frustration with the length of time it takes to release women from Framingham. Also at this meeting the group asked if EOHS would continue to sponsor meetings of the task force because it provided a helpful forum to discuss differences between programs. This was also the first meeting attended by new DRC programs from Barnstable County and Essex County, and the meeting provided an opportunity for the newer programs to learn from the experiences of the more established programs.

III. Development of Standards

As mentioned in our interim report, an initial survey was done of the existing day reporting centers to establish a base of information from which to develop a set of standards and management information system. Survey results indicated that the most commonalities were found in offense exclusions, termination criteria, drug testing, and community notification. The areas with the most differences were frequency of client check-ins, frequency of drug testing, range of admissions (sentenced, pre-trial or both), and participation of female offenders.

All of the programs were operating under the same legal authority, which was thoroughly reviewed and discussed at early task force meetings. Massachusetts General Law c.127, s. 48 & 49 authorize a correctional administrator to allow an inmate to participate in education, training or employment programs outside correctional facilities. It was decided by task force members to work towards having this legislation changed to include language specifically referring to day reporting centers.

All of the programs were using some form of community release agreement, based on a model developed by the Massachusetts Department of Correction. The task force

worked out a basic release agreement for day reporting centers, which allows each jurisdiction to add its own conditions to meet local needs and concerns.

The initial survey revealed similar but varied eligibility criteria being used by the original five programs. This aspect of the standards work led to the most animated discussions of our meetings. Task force members were at first very tentative about changing any of their individual eligibility or admissions criteria, finding it difficult to focus on statewide application rather than individual practices. We were finally able to reach agreement on a set of eligibility criteria which reflect the overall intent of day reporting centers without restricting the uniqueness of individual programs and jurisdictions. The criteria address time to release, offense exclusion, period of confinement, warrants, restraining orders, disciplinary reports, community notification, classification, residence, means of support and telephone access.

Each draft of the actual standards was presented to the full task force for discussion and review. Once the eligibility criteria had been agreed upon, the actual program standards were more easily developed. The final set of standards and related task force documents are included in the appendix.

IV. Management Information System

In addition to the differing policies and practices of the five DRC's as described above, the Executive Office of Human Services (the state agency responsible for oversight of DRC budgets) was concerned about the range of record keeping practices employed by the DRC programs. The state, as a condition of receiving funding, required a quarterly progress report from each program. This progress report was to contain information on the prior three months' activity of the centers, but specifically what information and how it was to be conveyed was left to the discretion of each program. This resulted in disparate reporting practices ranging from one program which submitted a computerized set of graphics, to a three-page narrative summary from another. One goal of this project was to develop and implement a standardized MIS type reporting system.

The first step in this process was to review the prior progress reports submitted by each program to EOHS. Officials at EOHS provided the research staff with these reports. Analysis of these forms revealed that the variances in reporting practices occurred not only across programs, but also within programs, some of which had changed their reporting practices over time.

The second step in the analysis involved visiting each program and reviewing their record keeping forms and practices. This also revealed wide differences but there were some similarities. Most programs based their record keeping on those forms

developed by the Hampden County DRC since they were the first and the largest program. A second similarity was that all programs maintained a client based record keeping system, and a face sheet on each client was completed and maintained in the front of each file folder. This provided a common area to work with in developing a standardized MIS system.

At this time the quarterly progress reports (those which did report figures at all) reported only aggregate figures. This put EOHS at a disadvantage in responding to requests for information since they could only report the various aggregate totals submitted to them. For example, if EOHS wanted to know how many drunk drivers successfully completed the program in the first quarter of 1989, they could not determine this information from the existing progress reports. The reports may well have in the aggregate the information needed, but it would be found in two separate sets of aggregate numbers - the number of drunk drivers in the program this quarter, and the number of successful completions in the quarter. After discussions between program staff, the researchers, and EOHS officials, it was decided to collect standardized individual level data from each program. This would give EOHS sufficient information in a flexible enough format to allow for computerized analysis.

After discussions with each program it was decided that the least intrusive method of collecting individual level data would be on the face sheet for each case, a copy of which could be forwarded to EOHS. A new face sheet was designed and forwarded to each program. After several revisions the new sheet was finalized and sent to each program. In an effort to get the most complete information on each case, we decided on the following process: client background information on the face sheet would be completed during initial classification and the face sheet stored in the client file. At a client's termination from the program, either successfully or as a result of reincarceration, the activity and termination portions of the form would be completed. At this point a copy of the completed form would be forwarded to EOHS.

A standardized form for the quarterly report was also worked out with task force members. When completed, this form would report aggregate admission and termination totals for the past quarter, the previous quarter and year to date. These totals would be provided to EOHS on more than 20 variables each quarter. To facilitate completion by program staff, it was decided that the quarterly report would include only those variables listed on the individual case sheets. Northeastern University would, as part of a pilot program, computerize the first set of submitted forms and run a preliminary analysis of client characteristics. Samples of both forms are included in the appendix.

The initial data set developed by Northeastern contained information on 270 individuals who completed day reporting programs during the last quarter of 1989. A preliminary description of clients served by the various day reporting centers indicated that the vast

majority of DRC clients were male (93%) and single (70%). Also, the DRC clients were evenly split along racial lines, with 50% Caucasian and 50% non-Caucasian (primarily Black and Hispanic). Although most of the clients were single, a surprising 50% reported having children.

Clients in this sample had two primary areas of need - educational support and substance abuse treatment. 54% had less than a high school degree and only 4% of the sample had any post high school education. Fully 80% of the DRC clients were categorized as having substance abuse problems. Among these clients, the most common substance abused was alcohol - accounting for 33% of the full sample. The second most common substance was cocaine - reported by 23% of the sample.

DRC clients, prior to release to the programs, were serving sentences on a wide variety of charges. The most common offense among them was operating under the influence - accounting for 14% of the sample. Other common offenses for which DRC clients served time were various narcotics offenses, burglary, larceny, receiving stolen goods, and probation violations. One interesting group of DRC clients was a group of nearly 10% of the sample who were incarcerated on assaultive charges. This group is excluded by statute, but may be included by direct court order or the order of a court appointed master. Both of these situations are in place in some Massachusetts county houses of correction at this time.

As indicated above, the DRC clients do represent a broad spectrum of the Massachusetts county correctional population. Clients were generally serving short incarceration terms, with 50% serving terms of 6 months or less, but one-third of those released to DRC's were serving sentences of a year or more. Another characteristic of these clients is that fully one-half of the DRC clients have been incarcerated before.

Regarding the activities of DRC clients in this sample, they were primarily working, enrolled in school or performing community service. 50% of the clients were working, 15% were enrolled in school, and 15% were performing some form of community service work, In addition 13% were involved in a restitution arrangement with the victim of their crime as a part of the DRC contract. Most clients (66%) were also involved in some form of substance abuse treatment, with clients generally averaging 4 such sessions per week.

Half of the DRC clients in this sample were released with some form of electronic monitoring. Both active and passive systems were used in this sample.

As indicated below, pre-trial detainees seem to have more difficulty completing the day reporting program than sentenced offenders. Some of the reasons suggested by task force members for this difference are: the reduced threat of action by the courts; lack of daily structure in their most recent activities; and the need for detoxification services.

As previous research on the Hampden County population indicated, most sentenced clients successfully complete Day Reporting programs. In this sample, 78% of these clients successfully completed the program; 20% were returned to higher custody by DRC staff for program violations; and only 2% failed the program due to the commission of a new crime or an escape. This supports previous findings of remarkably low DRC failure rates, which again indicate limited risk to public safety posed by the existance of these programs.

V. Pre-Trial Detainees

Currently, three of the original five programs admit pre-trial detainees. Because of the difference in legal status between detainees and sentenced offenders, it became clear that one set of standards could not apply to both groups. A sub-committee of the task force worked on the development of standards for this population.

The releasing authority for detainees is the court. This can occur at a bail appeal, with day center participation as a condition of release; or, in the case of one jurisdiction with a court-ordered cap, as an emergency release ordered by a special judge. In either case, custody of the client remains with the court, not with a correctional authority. Individual program designs may still set limits on the type of offender appropriate for participation, such as those charged with non-violent offenses.

A community release agreement remains an appropriate tool for use with detainees in order to outline the basic rules and regulations of participation. An amended version of the release agreement was developed by the sub-committee.

The eligibility criteria for detainees differs due to their legal status. For example, although there is no set time limit before a case is disposed of by the courts, the sub-committee felt strongly about including a limit to the amount of time a detainee could remain in the program. The issue of enforceable eligibility differs between programs which admit detainees as a matter of course, and those which admit them from an emergency release situation. The standards developed attempt to apply to both situations.

The success rates for detainees vary greatly from program to program and none are as successful as with sentenced offenders. Task force members continue to watch this population closely to determine future directions. Standards for pre-trial detainees are included in the appendix.

VI. Recommendations

- To increase the use of day reporting centers as a viable option within the criminal justice system and as a means to reduce the overcrowding of Massachusetts correctional institutions. Since most day reporting centers are operating at or near capacity, additional resources for staffing and operations will be necessary.

- To expand the definition of clients eligible for day reporting centers by amending the statutory provision prohibiting the participation of inmates incarcerated for certain offenses, and substituting emphasis on client profile as defined by day reporting center staff.

- To expand the use of day reporting centers for women incarcerated at Framingham and to continue efforts to streamline the classification process for these women.

- To continue the use of day reporting centers for pre-trial detainees while recognizing that these clients present unique challenges for day center programs.

- To conduct a study of the long-term post program success rates of day reporting center clients compared with similar inmates released without day reporting.

APPENDIX

Standards

STANDARDS FOR MASSACHUSETTS DAY REPORTING CENTERS

A. Legal Authorization

1. Day Reporting Centers within the Commonwealth of Massachusetts shall be established in accordance with MGL c127 ss 48 & 49.

Discussion: This legislation authorizes the commissioner of correction or the administrator of a county correctional facility to allow an inmate to participate in education, training or employment programs outside correctional facilities.

2. Inmates convicted of certain offenses as listed in MCL c127 ss 49 shall be excluded from participation, except with the specific approval of the correctional authority.

3. Participants must have served a reasonable period of confinement to be determined by the correctional authority.

4. Participants must be within six months of their anticipated return to the community.

5. The length of time spent participating in the day reporting center shall be credited toward the serving of the sentence.

6. Participants shall remain subject to the rules and regulations of the correctional facility from which they were transferred.

7. Participants who leave an approved location or fail to return when scheduled shall be charged with escape.

8. The rate of pay and other conditions of employment for day reporting center participants must be the same as for other employees doing similar work.

9. No participants shall be employed where a strike or work stoppage exists.

10. Prior to admission, a community release agreement outlining basic program rules and regulations shall be reviewed with each participant. The agreement shall be signed by both the participant and staff.

Discussion: This agreement shall include but not be limited to the areas covered in the community release agreement developed by the Executive Office of Human Services. It is expected that each jurisdiction will complement this agreement with conditions addressing their individual needs and regulations.

B. Screening/Assessment

1. Written eligibility and admission criteria shall include but not be limited to:
 a. Time remaining to release
 b. Offense type, legal status
 c. Period of confinement
 d. Review of criminal history and institution record
 e. Classification review
 f. Community notification
 g. Verification of residence and means of support
 h. Access to telephone

2. Written eligibility and admission criteria shall not discriminate on the basis of sex, handicap, race, creed, national origin, political belief or veteran status.

3. Written policies and procedures shall provide that potential participants are screened in accordance with eligibility and admissions criteria.

Discussion: The screening should include assessment of physical and mental health, education, employment and substance abuse problems.
Regarding female offenders housed at M.C.I. Framingham, particular attention shall be given to interfacing with the institution, the screening and assessment process, and to staff sensitivity to their unique needs, in order to guarantee equal access to program participation.

C. Program

1. Written program summary shall include but not be limited to:
 a. Statement of program philosophy and goals
 b. Program description
 c. Target population
 d. Operations
 e. Staffing structure
 f. Evaluation
 g. Resources

Discussion: The suggested components are in accordance with EOHS guidelines. Particular attention should be given to special populations such as female offenders and substance abusers.

2. Written policies and procedures shall include but not be limited to:
 a. Program operations
 b. Disciplinary process
 c. Termination process
 d. Record keeping
 e. Community linkages
 f. Plan for program evaluation

Discussion: It is recommended that centers located in areas with access to Comprehensive Offender Employment Resource System (COERS) offices should utilize the employment and other services provided by this offender-specific resource. It is further recommended that all centers coordinate with local agencies for provision of services, particularly regarding special populations such as female offenders and substance abusers.

3. A contract shall be developed between each participant, institution and day reporting center with objectives addressing reparation, restraint and rehabilitation activities. The contract should include, at a minimum: intake information, verifications (residence, employment), and program objectives.

Discussion: Reparation refers to payment of court-ordered fines, victim restitution, child support, community work service. Restraint refers to supervision, reporting, curfew and drug testing. Rehabilitation refers to employment, education, financial planning, substance abuse and mental health treatment.

D. Administration

1. A system for identifying, collecting, documenting, organizing, processing and reporting program information, operations and activities shall be developed and implemented.

Discussion: EOHS funded programs must use, at a minimum, the standardized individual case sheets and quarterly report forms.

2. A system for financial record keeping and reporting shall be developed and implemented which adheres to internal (institution or agency) policies and to EOHS regulations.

3. Programs shall have a personnel manual which is available to all staff and which includes but is not be limited to:

a. Employee application and selection
b. Organizational structure
c. Employee fringe benefits
d. Personnel policies and procedures
e. Office policies and procedures
f. Job descriptions

Discussion: Existing institution or agency personnel policies may be applied to center employees providing these are updated to include center-specific information.

STANDARDS FOR MASSACHUSETTS DAY REPORTING CENTERS
PRE-TRIAL DETAINEES

A. Legal Authorization

1. The authority for releasing pre-trial detainees to a day reporting center is the court.

Discussion: This may occur through a bail appeal petition or through a special judge in the case of jurisdictions in court-ordered release situations.

2. Only inmates charged with non-violent offenses will be eligible for release to a day reporting center.

3. Pre-trial participation in a day reporting center shall not exceed 120 days.

Discussion: Out of concern that detainees may be "forgotten" once released to a program. this maximum length of stay is recommended. Efforts must be maintained to ensure a speedy trial for all participants.

4. Prior to admission, a community release agreement outlining basic program rules and regulations shall be reviewed with each participant. The agreement shall be signed by both the participant and staff.

Discussion: This agreement shall include but not be limited to the areas covered in the pre-trial community release agreement developed by the Executive Office of Human Services. It is expected that each jurisdiction will complement this agreement with conditions addressing their individual needs and regulations.

B. Screening/Assessment

1. Written eligibility and admission criteria shall include but not be limited to:
   a. Length of stay in the program
   b. Offense type and legal status
   c. Review of criminal history and institution record
   d. Verification of residence

2. Written eligibility and admission criteria shall not discriminate on the basis of sex, handicap, race, creed, national origin, political belief or veteran status.

3. Written policies and procedures shall provide that potential participants are screened in accordance with eligibility and admissions criteria.

Discussion: The screening should include assessment of physical and mental health, education, employment and substance abuse problems.

Discussion: Regarding female offenders housed in the Awaiting Trial Unit at M.C.I. Framingham, particular attention shall be given to interfacing with the institution, the screening and assessment process, and to staff sensitivity to their unique needs, in order to guarantee equal access to program participation.

C. Program

See standards for sentenced population.

D. Administration

See standards for sentenced population.

Eligibility Criteria

Eligibility Criteria - Sentenced Offenders

Time to Release: Within 6 months of anticipated return to the community. Exceptions only with individual case approval of correctional authority.

Offense Exclusion: Violent offenders, those who present a threat to the community.

Period of Confinement: Reasonable period, as defined by the correctional authority.

Warrants/Detainers: Check through NCIC at a minimum. Check with court of sentencing, home and work community if possible. No warrants for offenses listed in M.G.L. 127.

Restraining Orders: Check nature of the order. Check with individual listed on order and local police. Put additional restrictions on client.

Disciplinary Reports: No recent history of disciplinary reports. Minimum of 2 months of stability.

Police Notification: Notify local community of client's participation in the program.

Classification Review: Include probation check, NCIC, and institutional record review, at a minimum.

Residence: Verify prior to admission. Within county of program, if possible. Transfer to program in other county, if possible.

Means of Support: Verify prior to admission.

Telephone: Access to telephone is mandatory.

ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA

	PROJECT COAP	HDRC	MDRC	NORFOLK	BROCKTON
Time to release	Within 6 mo. of confirmed parole wrap.	Within 4 mo. of p.e. or wrap.	Within 3 mo. of p.e. or wrap.	Not less than 2 mo. left.	Jailbound to serve no more than 6 mo.
Offense exclusion	MGL c127 ss49	MGL c127 ss49	MGL c127 ss49	MGL c127 ss49, and no sex offense, escape/attempt to to escape or history of violence	No weapons charges, OUI's or mandatory charges.
Warrants/ Detainers	No serious outstanding	No serious outstanding	No serious outstanding	No serious outstanding	
Restraining Orders	Rarely elig.	Rarely elig.	Not eligible	Rarely elig.	
Disciplinary Reports	No recent major D-reports	No recent major D-reports	No recent major D-reports	2 mo. stability after D-report	

ADMISSION CRITERIA

Classification Review	Required	Required	Required	Required	
Residence	In Worc. County	In Hampden County	In Middlesex or Suffolk County	Within reasonable distance from prog.	Within Brockton District Court jurisdiction
Means of Support	Verified	Verified	Verified	Verified	
Telephone	Necessary	Access necessary	Access necessary	Necessary	

Eligibility Criteria - Pre-Trial Detainees

Time in Program: Maximum of 120 days.

Offense Exclusion: Those charged with violent offenses.

Warrants/Detainers: Do NCIC and court check. Take warrants for misdemeanors.

Restraining Orders: Check nature of the order. Check with individual listed on order and local police. Put additional restrictions on client.

Institution Record Review: Include, if possible, probation review, prior record at institution, disciplinary reports.

Residence: Verify prior to admission, if possible. Within county of program, if possible. Transfer to program in other county, if possible.

Initial Survey

DRAFT

Massachusetts Day Reporting Centers

Program Components Questionnaire

---

1. Could you please tell us your program's goals?
   Are these written down anywhere?

2. Could you please describe who you see to be your target population(s)?

3. Could you please trace a typical case as it proceeds through the entire DRC process? Please include:
   - Eligibility criteria
   - Screening and assessment process
   - Orientation
   - Urinalysis
   - Residency requirements
   - Treatment programs
   - Termination procedures

4. Could we look at two actual case files and follow them through the process described above?

5. Do you use electronic monitoring? If yes:
   - Please describe the system
   - Please describe how you use the system
   - How effective do you feel electronic monitoring is?

6. Do you have a plan for program evaluation? Could you describe it?

7. What client information are you presently collecting?
   How is it stored?
   How long have you collected this information?
   How do you use it?
   Is there any other information you would like to have?

8. Please describe your interaction with your community and any public relations activities you have undertaken.

9. Do you have any programs geared specifically for female offenders? Please describe.

10. What programming do you offer to address substance abuse issues?

11. Please describe any unique components to your program.

12. What do you see as the short term and long term needs of your program?

13. Could we get copies of the following documents?
Operating budget for last year
Program description or handbook
Program policies and procedures
Client contract forms
Client data forms
Organizational chart

I. INTRODUCTION

The Crime and Justice Foundation and the Center for Applied Social Research of Northeastern University have completed an initial survey of the five day reporting centers currently operating in the state of Massachusetts. The programs involved all receive funding under the State's Neil Houston Corrections Alternative Program and include: the Electronic Incarceration Program (EIP) of Norfolk County, the Correctional Opportunity Advancement Program (COAP) of Worcester County, the Hampden County Day Reporting Center (HDRC), the Metropolitan Day Reporting Center (MDRC) serving Middlesex and Suffolk Counties, and the Plymouth County Correctional Alternatives Program operated by IUE/The Work Connection.

During January and February, interviews were held with program staff at each site using a survey instrument which focused on program components and operations. A great deal of material was collected on each program including program descriptions, contract forms, data collection forms, and policy and procedures. The collected information was then collated and a one page summary of each program compiled (see attached).

II. COMMON AREAS FOR STANDARDIZING POLICIES AND PROCEDURES

The programs all have their own unique components and different methods of operation. We were able to identify four general areas in which there are common policies and procedures among the programs surveyed.

Offense: All of the programs accept referrals on all offenders with the exception of those convicted of or charged with serious violent crimes and sex offenses.

Termination: All of the programs terminate clients from participation for escape and drug use. Four of the five programs terminate clients for both escape and drug use on a first offense basis. Three of the programs terminate for any drug use, one terminates only for use of heroin and cocaine.

Urinalysis Testing: All of the programs use some form of urinalysis testing. The frequency of testing varies from program to program although all test at least once a week. Four of the five programs mandate testing for all participants. Two programs have their own testing equipment; the others use outside labs.

Community Notification: All of the programs notify local police departments and employers before an individual is placed in the program. This is done either directly by the program or by the releasing institution.

III. STATISTICAL FINDINGS

Total Clients Served: Since the first day reporting center opened in October 1986 to February 1989, nearly 700 clients have entered programs across the State. The Hampden County Day Reporting Center (HDRC) has been in operation the longest - over two years - and has served the most clients (300). Most of the other centers have been in operation for just about one year and have serviced approximately 100 clients each. It is noteworthy that the HDRC served approximately 100 clients during it's first 18 months of operation, and since that time has increased its client base significantly. This indicates that the other centers may experience similar increases in clients served during the next year.

Size of Program: Most centers seem to operate with a similar daily count. The average number of clients in the programs at the time of our interviews was 17, with sizes of particular programs ranging from 10 clients (Brockton) to 26 clients (Worcester). The HDRC, again the most established program, is further along in its development than the others, operating with 74 clients at the time of our interviews. They averaged slightly less than 20 clients per month during their first 18 months, which leads us to forecast that as with total clients served, the four other DRC programs can look to increases in their program size in future months.

Administrative Terminations: All of the programs seem to be policing themselves rather well since the vast majority of those terminated (approximately one-third of the total admitted) were returned to the institution by program staff with very few cases terminated by arrest. On average, about one-third of all clients who begin one of the DRC programs are returned to the institution for an administrative infraction, generally drug or alcohol use or escape. However, the individual return rates differ a great deal across programs, ranging from a return rate of 50% for Brockton to the lowest return rate of 14% for Norfolk.

Arrests: DRC's continue to offer few public safety concerns for communities in Massachusetts. As indicated above, the programs seem to be policing themselves very effectively. This is accomplished by effective screening at admission combined with a willingness to use administrative terminations for those clients experiencing difficulties. Overall, there have been 17 arrests out of the 700 clients participating in the programs for an arrest rate of 2.4%. Primarily, these arrests have been for possession of controlled substances. No individual has been arrested to date for a crime of violence.

IV. RECOMMENDATIONS

The intent of doing this initial survey was to establish a base of information from which to build a set of guidelines for existing and future day reporting centers and from which to develop a statewide MIS system. The information described above provides the foundation from which we can begin development work.

We suggest that this information provides a large enough basis for the next step, convening a task force, as was discussed at the October meeting of day reporting centers. Ideally, the task force should include a representative from each of the five programs surveyed and a representative from EOHS.

We also met with the Comprehensive Offender Employment Resource System (COERS) in the course of our survey work. All of the programs have access to a COERS program and utilize them to a great extent for employment assistance and other services. We recommend that COERS also be invited to participate on the task force.

We recommend that special attention be devoted to guidelines regarding the particular needs of substance abusers and female offenders. All of the programs are addressing concerns in these areas, but we were unable to identify any common practices among them. We suggest that task force attention and discussions could be a great help in identifying successful operations and in developing some common guidelines.

Finally, we met with a great deal of energy and interest in this project while doing the on-site interviews. We recommend convening the task force in the very near future in order to build on that energy while it is still fresh.

CORRECTIONAL OPPORTUNITY ADVANCEMENT PROGRAM (COAP)

Program Started:
Operated By: Worcester County Sheriffs Department
Site Visit: January 31, 1989

Eligibility

Time left in sentence: 6 months.
Offense: No violent crimes or sex offenses. Priority given to first time offenders.

Termination Criteria

First Offense: Escape or use of heroin or Cocaine.
Second Offense: Recurring absences, use of alcohol or marijuana.

Target Population Worcester County Jail and HOC inmates within 6 months of release.

Special Clients: MCI Framingham women who live in Worcester County. No pre-trial detainees yet.

Treatment Programs

In-House: Discretionary counseling by staff.
Community: AA, NA
Mandatory: Minimum of 4 NA or AA meetings per week for participants with substance abuse problem.

Electronic Monitoring

System: On Guard, 25 units (passive).
Eligibility: All upon entry to the program. Monitor may be removed for those participants nearing completion of the program.

Urinalysis Testing

Frequency: Every 3 to 4 days, either on-site in the community or in-house.

Applicable Group: All participants.

Residency Requirements

Non-family member: Yes. Must have telephone. Looking for most supportive environment.

Alone: Yes, rarely.

Community Notification Police (hand delivered) and employer.

# of Clients in Program 143 (26 at present)

# of Arrests 2 (both possession)

% Successful Completion 70%

Staffing 12 full time (1 director, 4 social workers, 6 correctional officers and 1 clerk)

Coverage 24 hours per day, 7 days per week.

ELECTRONIC INCARCERATION PROGRAM (EIP)

Program Started:
Operated By: Norfolk County Sheriffs Department
Site Visit: January 19, 1989

Eligibility	
Time left in sentence:	60 days.
Offense:	No violent crimes or sex offenses.
Termination Criteria	
First Offense:	Escape or use of drugs.
Second Offense:	Recurring absences, use of alcohol or marijuana.
Target Population	Norfolk County HOC inmates with 60 days remaining.
Special Clients:	MCI Framingham women who live in Norfolk County.
Treatment Programs	
In-House:	Advocates for Human Potential.
Community:	AA and NA recommended for clients with substance abuse problem.
Electronic Monitoring	
System:	BI Home Escort (active)
Eligibility:	Mandatory for all participants.
Urinalysis Testing	
Frequency:	Once per week, minimum.
Applicable Group:	All participants.
Residency Requirements	
Non-family member:	Yes, in special cases such as in-patient treatment.
Alone:	Yes, rarely.
Community Notification	Police, employer and probation officer.
# of Clients in Program	103 (13 at present)
# of Arrests	1 (possession)
% Successful Completion	86%, sentenced
Staffing	4 full time program staff (1 director, 3 program officers)
Coverage	24 hours per day, 7 days per week. Evening and weekend coverage by beeper.
Miscellaneous	Interested in regional drug testing lab. Staff also run pre-release center. Clients are charged a fee for the electronic monitoring equipment, up to $70.00 per week; raised $10,000 last year.

METROPOLITAN DAY REPORTING CENTER

Program Started: 12/08/87
Operated by: The Crime and Justice Foundation
Site Visit: 01/20/89

Eligibility

Time left in sentence: Minimum of 15 days, maximum of 90 days.
Offense: No serious violent offense, serious outstanding warrants or restraining orders.

Termination Criteria

First offense: New crime, escape, positive urine test, default.
Second offense: Repeated contract violations.

Target Population

Sentenced: Middlesex and Suffolk county men and women within 90 days of release.

Pre-Trial: Middlesex and Suffolk county men and women who have been held for at least 48 hours.

Treatment Programs

In house: Case management services, addiction education groups, transition issues group.

Community: Substance abuse and mental health counseling, basic education, vocational training, job development, community work service.

Mandatory: Transition group for all, community service for sentenced, substance abuse activities for clients with abuse problem.

Electronic Monitoring Not used.

Urinalysis Testing

Frequency: Two to three times per week.
Applicable group: All.

Residency Requirements

Non-family member: Yes, must have access to telephone.
Alone: Yes, must have access to telephone.

Community Notification Police are notified by the releasing institution. Program contacts employers and probation.

# of Clients in Program 114 to date (18 at present)

# of Arrests 2 new crimes (motor vehicle related)
4 escapes (3 returned)

% Successful Completion 65%

Staffing 6 full time (5 case managers, 1 program coordinator)

Coverage 24 hours (14 hrs. staffed, 10 hrs. beeper)
7 days per week.

Miscellaneous Program serves two counties, five facilities.
Need for additional staff.
Interested in regional drug [illegible]

HAMPDEN COUNTY DAY REPORTING CENTER
Program Started: 10/86
Operated By: Hampden County Sheriffs Department
Site Visit: 01/17/89

Eligibility
Time left in sentence: 120 days prior to wrap-up or parole.
Offense: No violent offenses or sex offenses.

Termination Criteria
First Offense: Escape or use of drugs or alcohol.
Second Offense: Repeated minor violations.

Target Population
Hampden County HOC inmates.
WMCAC inmates.
MCI Framingham women who live in Hampden County.
DOC inmates transferred to Hampden HOC.
Hampden County pre-trial detainees.

Treatment Programs
In-House: 21 day substance abuse program, AA, NA, GED classes, aftercare, family counseling program.
Community: SERC.

Electronic Monitoring
System: On Guard (passive).
Eligibility: Mandatory for sentenced up to Phase III. Not used with Phase IV or pre-trial detainees.

Urinalysis Testing
Frequency: Twice per week, minimum.
Applicable Group: All participants.

Residency Requirements
Non-family member alone: Yes, in special cases.
Yes, rarely.

Community Notification: Police, employer and sponsor.

# of Clients in Program: 300 (74 at present)

# of Arrests: 1 (motor vehicle violation)

Successful Completion: 82%, sentenced

taffing: 4 full time program staff, 4 full time substance abuse staff.

overage: 24 hours per day, 7 days per week.

in the program.

PLYMOUTH COUNTY CORRECTIONAL ALTERNATIVES PROGRAM

Program started: 4/88
Operated by: IUE/The Work Connection, Inc.
Site visit: 01/18/89

Eligibility

Time left in sentence: Maximum of 90 days participation
Offense: No violent crimes, weapons charges, OUI's, sex offenses, major drug dealers or career criminals.

Termination Criteria

First offense: ---
Second offense: Absence from approved location or positive urine test, for house incarceration clients. Re-arrest for same crime, for pre-trial clients.

Target Population

House incarceration: Incarcerated men and women who live within the jurisdiction of the Brockton District Court.

Pre-Trial detainees: Men and women who live within the jurisdiction of the Brockton District Court.

Treatment Programs

In house: ---
In community: AA, NA, job development, education.
Mandatory: Only those activities ordered by the court.

Electronic Monitoring

Not used.

Urinalysis

Frequency: Infrequent testing
Applicable group: All house incarceration clients. Pre-trial detainees if ordered by the court.

Residency Requirements

Non-family member: Yes, must have telephone.
Alone: Yes, must have telephone.

Community Notification

All notification is done by court.

# of Clients in Program House incarceration: 9 (3 active)
Pre-trial: 27 (7 active)

# of Arrests 7

% Successful Completion 45% - 50%

Staffing 2 full time staff, 1 part time mentor

Coverage House incarceration: 24 hours, 7 days per week.
Pre-Trial: daily if unemployed, weekly if working or in treatment.

Miscellaneous All clients are released to Brockton District Court Probation conditional on participation in the program.

The attached Community Release Agreement represents basic rules and regulations for day reporting center participants. Individual programs are encouraged to add their own conditions to this base in order to address the needs and concerns of particular programs and institutions.

COMMUNITY RELEASE AGREEMENT

1. I understand that the Day Reporting Center (DRC) is an extension of the confines of the institution and all rules and regulations will be in effect throughout my community release time. I shall conduct myself in accordance with the laws of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts and the community in which I am participating.

2. I shall abide by all rules and regulations set forth by the DRC and follow the specific conditions of my contract.

3. I shall carry upon my person at all times my DRC identification card. I understand that I may be required to exhibit my I.D. card to law enforcement personnel upon their request. I shall immediately notify DRC staff of any contact or involvement with law enforcement personnel.

4. In the event of an emergency, unforseen difficulty or any change in my approved activities, I shall contact the DRC immediately.

5. I understand that leaving any approved destination - place of employment, education, counseling, home - without authorization by the DRC shall be considered an escape and I shall be subject to prosecution. I also understand that if I do not report to the DRC at the designated time, this shall be considered an escape and I shall be subject to prosecution.

6. I understand that my presence at my approved place of residence or other approved location is subject to frequent verification by telephone or by staff visit.

7. I shall not use alcohol, drugs or any unauthorized medication (including over the counter medications), nor will I attempt to introduce any of the above into the center. I shall immediately notify DRC staff if any medication has been prescribed for my use by a physician for an existing condition. I also understand that I shall be subject to drug testing and personal search at any time.

8. I shall not possess or use any firearms, dangerous weapons, or articles deemed as contraband as defined by the policies and procedures of the institution.

9. I understand that the DRC staff must approve all transportation arrangements, including destination, vehicle, valid license, driver and route to and from approved destinations, in accordance with the policies and procedures of the insitution.

10. I understand that while on community release, I may not associate with or contact in any manner, any ex-prisoner other than those with whom I must make contact to carry out approved release functions.

11. I understand that while on community release, I may not associate with or contact in any manner any victim or other person similarly associated with my offense without the specific approval of DRC staff.

12. I shall not enter into any civil contract or incur any indebtedness without the approval of the DRC.

13. I shall not act as a strike breaker or participate in any strike, demonstration or similar activity occurring at my place of employment or school.

14. I authorize DRC staff to contact prospective employers and other program sponsors as necessary to monitor my program performance and discuss my current status.

15. I understand that while I am participating in the program, I am required to pay any restitution, compensation and/or fines for which I am responsible.

16.

17.

18.

19.

20.

I have read, have had explained to me fully, and understand the above rules and regulations and agree to abide by them fully. I understand that any deviation may result in my removal from the program.

_____

Client Signature DATE

_____

Case Manager DATE

COMMUNITY RELEASE AGREEMENT
PRE-TRIAL DETAINEES

1. I understand that my participation in the Day Reporting Center (DRC) is at the discretion of the court. I shall conduct myself in accordance with the laws of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts and the community in which I am residing.

2. I shall abide by all rules and regulations set forth by the DRC and follow the specific conditions of my contract.

3. I shall carry upon my person at all times my DRC identification card. I understand that I may be required to exhibit my I.D. card to law enforcement personnel upon their request. I shall immediately notify DRC staff of any contact or involvement with law enforcement personnel.

4. In the event of an emergency, unforseen difficulty or any change in my approved activities, I shall contact the DRC immediately.

5. I understand that any major violation of DRC rules shall be grounds for termination from the program. I understand that major violations include being out of place for an extended period of time, arrest, default and drug use. I understand that the court will be notified of such termination and that my release may be revoked.

6. I understand that my presence at my approved place of residence or other approved location is subject to frequent verification by telephone or by staff visit.

7. I shall not use alcohol, drugs or any unauthorized medication (including over the counter medications), nor will I attempt to introduce any of the above into the center. I shall immediately notify DRC staff if any medication has been prescribed for my use by a physician for an existing condition. I also understand that I shall be subject to drug testing and personal search at any time.

8. I shall not possess or use any firearms, dangerous weapons, or articles deemed as contraband as defined by the policies and procedures of the program.

9. I understand that the DRC staff must approve all transportation arrangements, including destination, vehicle, valid license, driver and route to and from approved destinations, in accordance with the policies and procedures of the program.

10. I understand that while on community release, I may not associate with or contact in any manner, any ex-prisoner other than those with whom I must make contact to carry out approved

release functions.

11. I understand that while on community release, I may not associate with or contact in any manner any victim or other person similarly associated with my offense without the specific approval of DRC staff.

12. I authorize DRC staff to contact prospective employers and other program sponsors as necessary to monitor my program performance and discuss my current status.

13. I understand that while I am participating in the program, I am required to pay any restitution, compensation and/or fines for which I am responsible.

14.

15.

16.

17.

18.

19.

20.

I have read, have had explained to me fully, and understand the above rules and regulations and agree to abide by them fully. I understand that any deviation may result in my removal from the program.

_____

Client Signature DATE

_____

Case Manager DATE

MIS Forms

INDIVIDUAL CASE SHEET

DATE_____

1) SS#:_____ 2) NAME:_____
(Last,First,MI)

3) FACILITY:_____

4) DATE-ENTRANCE TO DAY REPORTING PROGRAM:(M/D/Y) _____

5) DATE TERMINATED FROM DAY REPORTING PROGRAM:(M/D/Y) _____

6) SEX:_____ 7) DATE OF BIRTH (M/D/Y) _____

8) RACE:_____
B W H A AI OTHER

9) MARITAL STATUS: Single Married Divorced Widow Separated

10) NUMBER OF CHILDREN:_____

11) EDUCATION LEVEL:(Last grade completed or GED) _____

12) SUBSTANCE ABUSE:(Primary)_____ 13) (Secondary) _____
(Marijuana, Cocaine, Heroin, Alcohol, Other, None)

14) PRESENT OFFENSE:_____ 15) ACCOMP OFFENSE

16) PRESENT SENTENCE:_____YEARS_____MONTHS_____DAYS

17) PRIOR INCARCERATIONS:(#)_____

18) MOST RECENT PRIOR OFFENSE_____

CLIENT ACTIVITY REPORT

(On average during the course of a client's stay in the Program)

19) EMPLOYMENT STATUS:_____ (F/t, P/t, other, none)

20) EDUCATION STATUS: _____ (Ged, Voc., College, other, none)

21) COMMUNITY SERVICE STATUS:_____ (Hours per week)

22) RESTITUTION STATUS:_____ (Yes____ No ____ Amount $_____)

23) SUBSTANCE ABUSE TREATMENT:_____(Drug ____ Alch ____ Both ___)

24) NUMBER OF SESSION PER WEEK:_____(Drug ____ Alch ____ Both ___)

25) TYPE OF SESSION:_____(Group ___ Indiv ___ Both____)

26) WAS CLIENT ON ELECTRONIC MONITORING @ TERMINATION (Yes _____ No ____)

TERMINATION

SUCCESSFUL:_____ FAILURE:_____ ADMINISTRATIVE:_____

BASIC SUMMARY INFORMATION
QUARTERLY REPORT

_____ DAY REPORTING CENTER REPORT DATE: ____/____/____

	LAST QUARTER	THIS QUARTER	YEAR TO DATE
I. ADMISSIONS:			
SOURCE:			
_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____
TOTAL	_____	_____	_____
II. CLIENT PROFILE: (For those admitted to the Program during this quarter)			
RACE:			
Caucasian	_____	_____	_____
Black	_____	_____	_____
Hispanic	_____	_____	_____
Asian	_____	_____	_____
Other	_____	_____	_____
SEX:			
Male	_____	_____	_____
Female	_____	_____	_____
AGE:			
17 - 20	_____	_____	_____
21 - 25	_____	_____	_____
26 - 30	_____	_____	_____
31 - 35	_____	_____	_____
36 - 40	_____	_____	_____
OVER 40	_____	_____	_____

	LAST QUARTER	THIS QUARTER	YEAR TO DATE
OFFENSE:			
Against the Person			
Drug Related			
Property Crime			
Violated Parole/ Probation			
O.U.I.			
Other			
Pre-trial			
REMAINING LENGTH OF SENTENCE:			
1 month			
2 months			
3 months			
4 months			
5 - 6 months			
7 - 12 months			
ORIGINAL SENTENCE LENGTH:			
1 month			
2 months			
3 months			
4 months			
5 - 6 months			
7 - 11 months			
12 - 24 months			
Over 24 months			
Pre-trial			

	LAST QUARTER	THIS QUARTER	YEAR TO DATE
III. CLIENT HISTORY:			
PRIMARY SUBSTANCE ABUSE:			
Marijuana	_____	_____	_____
Cocaine	_____	_____	_____
Heroin	_____	_____	_____
Hallucinogenics	_____	_____	_____
Tranquilizers	_____	_____	_____
Alcohol	_____	_____	_____
No use	_____	_____	_____
PRIOR INCARCERATIONS:			
-0-	_____	_____	_____
-1-	_____	_____	_____
-2-	_____	_____	_____
-3-	_____	_____	_____
-4-	_____	_____	_____
5 or more	_____	_____	_____
IV. LIVING SITUATION:			
w/sibling	_____	_____	_____
w/spouse	_____	_____	_____
w/ parents	_____	_____	_____
Alone	_____	_____	_____
Alone w/children	_____	_____	_____
Other _____	_____	_____	_____

	LAST QUARTER	THIS QUARTER	YEAR TO DATE
V. EMPLOYMENT STATUS:			
Full-time	_____	_____	_____
Part-time	_____	_____	_____
Job Search	_____	_____	_____
Unemployed	_____	_____	_____
VI. EDUCATION STATUS:			
Full-time student	_____	_____	_____
ABE/GED	_____	_____	_____
ESL	_____	_____	_____
Vocational	_____	_____	_____
College Level	_____	_____	_____
VII. COMMUNITY OBLIGATIONS:			
Community Service (# of clients)	_____	_____	_____
Restitution (# of clients)	_____	_____	_____
VIII. COUNSELING:			
Individual Substance Abuse	_____	_____	_____
Substance Abuse Treatment	_____	_____	_____
Residential	_____	_____	_____
Group Substance Abuse	_____	_____	_____
Family Counseling	_____	_____	_____
NA, AA Program	_____	_____	_____

THE FOLLOWING SECTION DEALS WITH THOSE INDIVIDUALS WHO TERMINATED YOUR PROGRAM DURING THE LAST QUARTER

	LAST QUARTER	THIS QUARTER	YEAR TO DATE
IX. TERMINATIONS:			
SUCCESSFUL COMPLETIONS:			
Sentence Expired	_____	_____	_____
Parole	_____	_____	_____
Case Dismissed	_____	_____	_____
Incarcerated (Pre-Trial)	_____	_____	_____
Probation (Pre-Trial)			
TOTAL	_____	_____	_____
ADMINISTRATIVE TERMINATIONS:			
Drug Use	_____	_____	_____
Contract Violations	_____	_____	_____
Withdrew	_____	_____	_____
Unexcused Absence	_____	_____	_____
Other_____	_____	_____	_____
TOTAL	_____	_____	_____
FAILURE:			
Crime Committed	_____	_____	_____
Escape	_____	_____	_____
Surety Revoked	_____	_____	_____
TOTAL	_____	_____	_____

	LAST QUARTER	THIS QUARTER	YEAR TO DATE
X. LENGTH OF STAY IN PROGRAM:			
Less than 1 month	_____	_____	_____
1 - 2 months	_____	_____	_____
3 - 4 months	_____	_____	_____
4 - 6 months	_____	_____	_____
6 months	_____	_____	_____

This narrative report is to be submitted with quarterly report forms. Please fill in those sections which apply to your program.

1. Briefly describe major accomplishments which occurred during this quarter.

2. Briefly describe any problems which occurred during this quarter.

3. Briefly describe any special plans for the upcoming quarter (i.e. new target population).

4. Other comments.